APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/450,941	11/29/1999	JACCO BROK	2493-13	8363

7590   07/16/2003

NIXON & VANDERHYE PC
1100 NORTH GLEBE ROAD
8TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA   22201

EXAMINER
LUDWIG, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	09/450,941		BROK ET AL.	
	Examiner		**Art Unit**	
	Matthew J. Ludwig		2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 November 1999</u> .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>29 November 1999</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>1</u> .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: application filed 11/29/99.

2.   Claims 1-20 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 3, 4, 12, 13, and 20 are independent

claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-20 Are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blumer et

al., U.S. Patent Number 5,890,171 filed (8/6/96).

In reference to independent claim 1, Blumer discloses:

- The web browser program allows the user to retrieve and display documents from

Web servers (compare to *"retrieving said at least one document from the database in response*

to a request for that document"). See column 5, lines 55-67.

- Web server then retrieves the document and returns it in an HTTP response message to

the Web browser. If the document has hypertext links, then the user may again select on of the

links to request that a new document be retrieved (compare to *"scanning the retrieved document*

to identify said links"). See column 6, lines 25-35.

Blumer does not explicitly disclose methods for transforming the links into a format,

which is recognizable by the document browser; however, the reference does mention a program,

which receives the results of a query. The program then constructs an HTML document that is

returned to the Web server, which then sends it to the Web browser. The transformation that

takes place during which HTML language is parsed and then displayed on a user's browser as

highlighted words or phrases would have been an obvious transformation of links into a format

recognizable by the document browser and would have given the user the added benefit of

locating documents anywhere on the internet.

In reference to dependent claim 2, Blumer discloses:

The base URL is used to determine the protocol identifier, machine name, optional port

and base directory for a relative URL. See column 4, lines 15-25. The URL methods taught by

Blumer, which demonstrate the locations of documents, perform similar document retrieval

methods. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to utilize URL's for determining the position of the requested documents, because it

would have given the user a proficient technique for document retrieval without the use of

indexes.

In reference to independent claims 3 & 4, Blumer discloses:

- The web browser program allows the user to retrieve and display documents from

Web servers (compare to *"retrieving said at least one document from the database in response*

to a request for that document"). See column 5, lines 55-67.

- Web server then retrieves the document and returns it in an HTTP response message to

the Web browser. If the document has hypertext links, then the user may again select on of the

links to request that a new document be retrieved (compare to *"scanning the retrieved document*

to identify said links"). See column 6, lines 25-35.

Blumer does not explicitly disclose methods for transforming the links into a format, which is recognizable by the document browser; however, the reference does mention a program, which receives the results of a query. The program then constructs an HTML document that is returned to the Web server, which then sends it to the Web browser. The transformation that takes place during which HTML language is parsed and then displayed on a user's browser as *highlighted words or phrases* would have been an obvious transformation of links into a format recognizable by the document browser and would have given the user the added benefit of locating documents anywhere on the internet.

In reference to dependent claim 5, Blumer discloses:

When managing large and complex web sites, to have the capability to include one document as part of another document. This feature allows a document fragment commonly used in many pages within a web to reside in one place for easy maintenance. See column 6, lines 55-67.

In reference to dependent claims 6 & 7, Blumer discloses:

The combination of the Web server and Web browser communicating using an HTTP protocol over a computer network is referred to herein as 'web architecture'. See column 5, lines 55-67.

In reference to dependent claim 8 & 9, Blumer discloses:

The Web server and the Web browser communicate using the Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) message protocol. The Web server checks for authorization, performs any requested action, and returns an HTTP message containing an HTML document. See column 6, lines 8-30.

In reference to dependent claim 10, Blumer discloses:

The documents are often hypertext documents in the HTML language, but may be other types of document objects as well, and may include images, audio, and/or video information. See column 4, lines 50-60.

In reference to dependent claim 11, Blumer discloses:

If the token is an HTML tag that specifies a hypertext link, if the link uses a relative URL, and if the document is being processed because it is included in another document, then the relative URL is rewritten. See column 11, lines 16-28.

In reference to independent claims 12, 13, and 20, the claims recite similar limitations to the method claims of 1 & 3 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

In reference to dependent claim 14, Blumer discloses:

The combination of the Web server and Web browser communicating using an HTTP protocol over a computer network is referred to herein as, 'web architecture'. See column 5, lines 55-67.

In reference to dependent claim 15-19, the claims recite similar limitations to that of 7-11 and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Judson   US Patent No. 5,572,643   filed (10/19/95)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 703-305-8043. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

ML
July 10, 2003

HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100